



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/519,420	08/25/95	FUKUNAGA	T 0756-1398

SIXBEY FRIEDMAN LEEDOM & FERGUSON P.C.
2010 CORPORATE RIDGE
SUITE 600
MCLEAN VA 22102

EXAMINER	
PADGETT, M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1112	10

DATE MAILED:

12/17/96

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run _____ or continues to run _____ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☒ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In/no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 12/6/96 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☒ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - ☒ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note). ?
 - ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☒ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: *The amendments to claims 1-2 create new issues, as these steps have not before been combined with the ~~known~~ claimed effects. Also it is unclear if the irradiating and thermal annealing are the same steps or not and "the temperature range..." lacks antecedent basis. Conversely, "the succeeding amendments" only add the effect to the claims. The participating and addition of impurities are new issues not previously claimed. Support for amendments other than 10, was not given, and that for*

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 1-4, 6-15 & 17-22

However;

☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): corrected the MC problem in claim 10

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because further consideration of the new issues is required, with the probability of reissues, 102 rejections to 103 rejections, etc.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

ent
☒ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☒ has not been approved by the examiner, because no attached sheet showing the proposed changes was found in the file

☒ Other as claimed is questionable. pagell gives temperature for heat treating
to that the ability to at 450-750C either before laser irradiation or after, but Mananand to get!